



Doshisha University Academic Repository

同志社大学学術リポジトリ

Kare and Kanozyo

著者 (英)	Satoru Nakai
journal or publication title	Doshisha studies in English
number	16
page range	147-172
year	1977-04
URL	http://doi.org/10.14988/pa.2017.0000001537

of using personal pronouns, Japanese deletes the repeated nouns. Kuroda concludes that pronominalization is nothing but the deletion of repeated nouns in Japanese and that the so-called personal pronouns are ordinary nouns.²

II

I admit that the zero form in Japanese corresponds to English pronouns, but I do not admit that *kare* and *kanozyo* are ordinary nouns.³ There are four reasons for doubting Kuroda's conclusion.

First of all, consider the following examples:

(3) Forward Pronominalization

- a. *John_i-wa [kare_i-ga hirotte kita]_s koinu-o daizini sodate-ta.*
 Top he-Subj picked up puppy-Obj carefully bring up-Past
 'John_i brought up carefully the puppy which he_i had picked up on the road.'
- b. *Mary_i-wa [[John-ga kanozyo_i-ni kekkon-o moosikon-da]_s*
 Top Subj she-to marriage-Obj propose-Past
keredomo]_{ADV} uresiku-na-katta.
 although glad-not-Past
 'Mary_i, although John had proposed marriage to her_i, was not glad.'
- c. *John_i-wa [[Mary-ga kare_i-o buzyokusi-ta]_s keredomo]_{ADV}*
 Top Subj he-Obj insult-Past although
heikidat-ta.
 calm-Past
 'John_i, although Mary had insulted him_i, was calm.'
- d. *sensei-wa [[Mary_i-ga kanningu-o si-ta]_s noni]_{ADV}*
 teacher-Top Subj cheated in the exam although

kanozyo_i-ni tyuu-i o atae-na-katta.
 she-to warning-Obj give-not-Past

'The teacher, although Mary_i had cheated in the exam, did not give a warning to her_i.'

- e. *John-wa* [[*Tom-ga Mary_i-ni minku-no koto-o oku-ta*]_S
 Top Subj to mink coat-Obj give-Past

keredomo]_{ADV} *kanozyo_i-ni nanimo okura-na-katta.*
 although she-to nothing give-not-Past

'John, although Tom had given Mary_i a mink coat, did not give her_i anything.'

- f. *John-wa* [[*Tom-ga Mary_i-o suisensi-ta*]_S *keredomo*]_{ADV}
 Top Subj Obj recommend-Past although

kanozyo_i-ni syoo-o atae-na-katta.
 she-to prize-Obj give-not-Past

'John, although Tom recommended Mary_i, did not give her_i a prize.'

- g. *John-wa* [[*Mary_i-ga iyagatte iru*]_S *noni*]_{ADV} *kanozyo_i-o*
 Top Subj unwilling is although she-Obj

paatii-ni turete itta.
 party-to taking went

'John, although Mary_i was unwilling, took her_i to the party.'

- h. *John_j-wa* [[ϕ _j *Mary_i-ni kekkon-o moosikon-da*]_S
 Top to marriage-Obj propose-Past

keredomo]_{ADV} *kanozyo_i-o kiratte iru.*
 although she-Obj hating is

'John_j, although ϕ _j proposed marriage to Mary_i, does not like her_i.'

- i. *John_j-wa* [[ϕ _j *Mary_i-o misute-ta*]_S *keredomo*]_{ADV} *zissaiwa*
 Top Obj desert-Past although to tell the truth

kanozyo_i-o aisite ita.

she-Obj loving was

‘To tell the truth, John_j, although ϕ_j had deserted Mary_i,
loved her_i.’

(4) Backward Pronominalization

- a. **kare_i-wa [John_i-ga hirotte kita]_s koinu-o daizini*
 he-Top Subj picked up puppy-Obj carefully
sodate-ta.
 bring up-Past
 ‘He_i brought up the puppy carefully which John_i had picked
 up on the road.’
- b. **kanozyo_i-wa [[John-ga Mary_i-ni kekkon-o moosikon-da]_s*
 she-Top Subj to marriage-Obj propose-Past
keredomo]_{ADV} uresiku-na-katta.
 although glad-not-Past
 ‘She_i, although John had proposed marriage to Mary_i, was not
 glad.’
- c. **kare_i-wa [[Mary-ga John_i-o buzuyokusi-ta]_s keredomo]_{ADV}*
 he-Top Subj Obj insult-Past although
heikidat-ta.
 calm-Past
 ‘He_i, although Mary had insulted John_i, was calm.’
- d. *?*sensei-wa [[kanozyo_i-ga kanningu-o si-ta]_s noni]_{ADV}*
 teacher-Top she-Subj cheated in the exam although
Mary_i-ni tyuu-i atae-na-katta.
 to warning-Obj give-not-Past
 ‘The teacher, although she_i had cheated in the exam, did not
 give a warning to Mary_i.’

- e. ?**John-wa* [[*Tom-ga kanozyo_i-ni minku-no kotoo-o okut-ta*]_S
 Top Subj she-to mink coat-Obj give-Past
noni]_{ADV} *Mary_i-ni nanimo okura-na-katta.*
 although to nothing give-not-Past
 ‘John, although Tom had given her_i a mink coat, did not give anything to Mary_i.’
- f. ?**John-wa* [[*Tom-ga kanozyo_i-o suisensi-ta*]_S *keredomo*]_{ADV}
 Top Subj she-Obj recommend-Past although
Mary_i-ni syoo-o atae-na-katta.
 to prize-Obj give-not-Past
 ‘John, although Tom recommended her_i, did not give a prize to Mary_i.’
- g. ?**John-wa* [[*kanozyo_i-ga iyagatte iru*]_S *noni*]_{ADV} *Mary_i-o*
 Top she-Subj unwilling is although Obj
paatii-ni turete itta.
 party-to taking went
 ‘John, although she_i was unwilling, took Mary_i to the party.’
- h. ?**John_j-wa* [[*φ_j kanozyo_i-ni kekkon-o moosikon-da*]_S
 Top she-to marriage-Obj propose-Past
keredomo]_{ADV} *Mary_i-o kiratte iru.*
 although Obj hating is
 ‘John_j, although φ_j proposed marriage to her_i, does not like Mary_i.’
- i. ?**John_j-wa* [[*φ_j kanozyo_i-o misute-ta*]_S *keredomo*]_{ADV}
 Top she-Obj desert-Past although
zissaiwa Mary_i-o aisite ita.
 to tell the truth Obj loving was
 ‘To tell the truth, John_j, although φ_j had deserted her_i, loved Mary_i.’

In (3a) through (3i), *kare* and *kanozyo* are used as an anaphoric element which has its antecedent in the same sentence. For example, in (3a), the referent of *kare* is the same person (who is called John) as the referent of the NP *John*. In other words, *John* and *kare* are coreferential.

Secondly, the use of *kare* and *kanozyo* is subject to the *precedence* constraint, which, with the *command* constraint, governs English pronominalization.⁴ As the examples in (4) show, the antecedent cannot follow *kare* or *kanozyo*.⁵ Full-pronominalization (I call the use of *kare* and *kanozyo* full-pronominalization as I said in footnote 2.) is subject to the following condition:

(5) *Prohibition of Backward Full-Pronominalization*.^{6,7}

A full-pronoun can be coreferential with an NP if the NP precedes the full-pronoun.

Thirdly, though Kuroda says that *kare* is modifiable by adjectives like ordinary nouns (e.g., *tiisai hito* 'small man' and *tiisai kare* 'small he'), the *kare* and *kanozyo* that are used anaphorically cannot be modified by adjectives. See the following examples:

- (6) a. **John_i-wa* [[*Mary-ga tiisa-i kare_i-no hon-o*
 Top Subj small-Pres he-of book-Obj

kenasi-ta]_S *node*]_{ADV} *okot-ta*.
 speak ill of-Past because get angry-Past

(*Tiisa-i* is meant to be modifying *kare*.)

'John_i, because Mary spoke ill of small-his_i book, got angry.'

- Cf. *John_i-wa* [[*Mary-ga kare_i-no hon-o kenasi-ta*]_S *node*]_{ADV} *okot-ta*.

'John_i, because Mary spoke ill of his_i book, got angry.'

- b. **sensei-wa* [[*Mary_i-ga kanningu-o si-ta*]_S *node*]_{ADV}
 teacher-Top Subj cheated in the exam because

tiisa-i kanozyo_i-ni tyuui-o atae-ta.
 small-Pres she-to warning-Obj give-Past

'The teacher, because Mary_i had cheated in the exam, gave a warning to small her_i.'

Cf. *sensei-wa [[Mary_i-ga kanningu-o si-ta]_s node]_{ADV} kanozyo_i-ni tyuui-o atae-ta.*

'The teacher, because Mary_i had cheated in the exam, gave a warning to her_i.'

Fourthly, let us consider the noncoreference rule proposed by Lasnik. Lasnik (1976) proposes that the only relevant condition on anaphoric relations in English is the following noncoreference rule:

(7) *Lasnik's Noncoreference Rule:*

If NP₁ precedes and commands NP₂, and NP₂ is not a pronoun, then NP₁ and NP₂ are noncoreferential. (p. 6)

According to the noncoreference rule, the two *Oscar*'s in (8a), where one *Oscar* both commands and precedes the other *Oscar*, are noncoreferential, but the two *Oscar*'s in (8b), where one *Oscar* does not both command and precede the other *Oscar*, can be coreferential.

(8) a. **Oscar_i finally realized that Oscar_i is unpopular.* (Lasnik's (4a))

b. *That Oscar_i is unpopular was finally realized by Oscar_i.*
 (Lasnik' (5a))

Now, if Lasnik is correct and if the noncoreference rule is also relevant in Japanese, the noncoreference rule can be used to distinguish pronouns from ordinary nouns. So let us see whether the noncoreference rule is relevant in Japanese, too.

The noncoreference rule seems to be relevant in Japanese. When a full noun both commands and precedes the other full noun, the two full

nouns cannot be coreferential. In (9), where one *John* both commands and precedes the other *John*, the two *John*'s are not coreferential. But in (10), where one *Mary* does not both command and precede the other *Mary*, the two *Mary*'s can be coreferential.

- (9) a. **John_i-wa* [[*John_i-ga issyookenmei benkyoosi-ta*]_S *keredomo*]_{ADV}
 Top Subj hard study-Past although
 siken-ni sippaisi-ta.
 examination-in fail-Past
 ‘John_i, although John_i had studied hard, failed the examination.’
- b. **John_i-wa* [[*Mary-ga John_i-o nagut-ta*]_S *ato-de*]_{ADV}
 Top Subj Obj hit-Past after
 zisatusi-ta.
 commit suicide-Past
 ‘John_i, after Mary hit John_i, committed suicide.’
- c. **John_i-wa* [[*sensei-ga John_i-ni yoozi-o iituke-ta*]_S *toki*]_{ADV}
 Top teacher-Subj to errand-Obj order-Past when
 kiite i-na-katta.
 listening be-not-Past
 ‘John_i, when the teacher ordered John_i to go on an errand, was not listening to the teacher.’
- (10) a. **John-wa* [[*Tom-ga Mary_i-ni puropoozusi-ta*]_S *toki*]_{ADV} *Mary_i-o*
 Top Subj to propose-Past when Obj
 aisite ita.
 loving was
 ‘John, when Tom proposed marriage to Mary_i, was in love with Mary_i.’
- b. **John-wa* [[*keikan-ga Mary_i-o taihosu-ru*]_S *mae-ni*]_{ADV}
 Top policeman-Subj Obj arrest-Pres before

Mary_i-ni zisyu-o susumete ita.

to surrender-Obj advising was

‘John, before the policeman arrested Mary_i, had already advised Mary_i to surrender herself to the police.’

- c. *John-wa [[Mary_i-ga iyagat-ta]_s keredomo]_{ADV} Mary_i-o paatii-ni*
 Top Subj refuse-Past although Obj party-to

turete itta.

taking went

‘John, although Mary_i was unwilling, took Mary_i to the party.’

The noncoreference rule must be applied after the application of Scrambling. If Scrambling is applied to (10) so that one *Mary* may both command and precede the other *Mary*, then the two *Mary*’s become noncoreferential. See the following examples:

- (11) a. **John-wa Mary_i-o [[Tom-ga Mary_i-ni puropoozusi-ta]_s toki]_{ADV}*
 Top Obj Subj to propose-Past when

aisite ita.

loving was

‘John was in love with Mary_i when Tom proposed marriage to Mary_i.’

- b. **John-wa Mary_i-ni [[keikan-ga Mary_i-o taihosu-ru]_s*
 Top to policeman-Subj Obj arrest-Pres

mae-ni]_{ADV} zisyu-o susumete ita.

before surrender-Obj advising was

‘John had already advised Mary_i to surrender herself_i to the police before the policeman arrested Marry_i.’

- c. **John-wa Mary_i-o [[Mary_i-ga iyagat-ta]_s keredomo]_{ADV} paatii-ni*
 Top Obj Subj refuse-Past although party-to

turete itta.

taking went

'John took Mary_i to the party although Mary_i was unwilling.'

The noncoreference rule predicts that the two *John*'s will become coreferential if Scrambling is applied to the sentences in (9) so that one *John* may not both command and precede the other *John*. The prediction is borne out as far as (b) and (c) are concerned.

- (12) a. *[[*John_i-ga issyookenmei benkyoosi-ta*]_S *keredomo*]_{ADV} *John_i-wa*
 Subj hard study-Past although Top
siken-ni sippaisi-ta.
 examination-in fail-Past

'Although John_i had studied hard, John_i failed the examination.'

- b. [[*Mary-ga John_i-o nagut-ta*]_S *ato-de*]_{ADV} *John_i-wa*
 Subj Obj hit-Past after Top
zisatusi-ta.
 commit suicide-Past

'After Mary hit John_i, John_i committed suicide.'

- c. [[*sensei-ga John_i-ni yoozi-o iituke-ta*]_S *toki*]_{ADV} *John_i-wa*
 teacher-Subj to errand-Obj order-Past when Top
kiite i-na-katta.
 listening be-not-Past

'When the teacher ordered John_i to go on an errand, John_i was not listening to the teacher.'

In (12a), the two *John*'s are still noncoreferential even though one *John* does not both command and precede the other *John*. There seems to be another condition in addition to Lasnik's noncoreference rule. The additional condition looks like the following:

- (13) Given a complex sentence, where NP₁ is the subject of the matrix clause and NP₂ is the subject of the embedded clause:

If both NP₁ and NP₂ are full nouns, then NP₁ and NP₂ are not coreferential.

(13) can account for the ungrammaticality of (12a), but it cannot account for the ungrammaticality of (14c).

(14) a. *John_i-wa [kare_i-ga hirotte ki-ta]_s koinu-o daizini*
 Top he-Subj picked up puppy-Obj carefully
sodate-ta.

bring up-Past

‘John_i brought up carefully the puppy which he_i had picked up on the road.’

b. **kare_i-wa [John_i-ga hirotte ki-ta]_s koinu-o daizini sodate-ta.*

‘He_i brought up carefully the puppy which John_i had picked up on the road.’

c. **[John_i-ga hirotte ki-ta]_s koinu-o kare_i-wa daizini sodate-ta.*

‘The puppy which John_i had picked up on the road he_i brought up carefully.’

The grammaticality of (14a) and the ungrammaticality of (14b) are explained in terms of the condition stated in (5). (14a) is grammatical because the antecedent *John* precedes *kare*, and (14b) is ungrammatical because the antecedent *John* follows *kare*. But the condition stated in (5) cannot explain the ungrammaticality of (14c), where the antecedent precedes the full-pronoun. Nor can (13) explain the ungrammaticality of (14c).

In order to account for (12a), (14b), and (14c), I revise (13) as follows:

(15) Given a complex sentence, where NP₁ is the subject of the matrix clause and NP₂ is the subject of the embedded clause:

If NP₂ is a full noun, then NP₁ and NP₂ are noncoreferential.⁸

According to (15), (12a), (14b), and (14c) are ungrammatical because in each sentence, the subject of the embedded clause, which is supposed to

be coreferential with the matrix subject, is a full noun.

Incidentally, the ungrammaticality of (14b) is accounted for by (15) as well as (5), because the subject of the embedded clause is a full noun and the full-pronoun precedes the antecedent.

Now I have proven that the noncoreference rule is relevant in Japanese as well as in English.⁹ Then let us use the noncoreference rule to see whether *kare* and *kanozyo* are ordinary nouns or not. Consider the following sentences (Disregard the difference of the particles in NP₁ and NP₂):

- (16) a. [*John_i-wa*]_{NP₁} [[*kare_i-ga*]_{NP₂} *zibun-de tate-ta*]_S *ie-ni*
 Top he-Subj for himself build-Past house-in
 sunde iru.
 living is
 ‘John_i is living in the house which he_i built for himself.’
- b. *[[*John_i-wa*]_{NP₁} [[*John_i-ga*]_{NP₂} *zibun-de tate-ta*]_S *ie-ni sunde iru.*
 ‘John_i is living in the house which John_i built for himself.’
- (17) a. [*John_i-wa*]_{NP₁} [[*Mary-ga [kare_i-o]*]_{NP₂} *hito-mae-de*
 Top Subj he-Obj before other people
 buziyokusi-ta]_S *node*]_{ADV} *zisatusi-ta.*
 insult-Past because commit suicide-Past
 ‘John_i, because Mary had insulted him_i before other people,
 committed suicide.’
- b. *[[*John_i-wa*]_{NP₁} [[*Mary-ga [John_i-o]*]_{NP₂} *hito-mae-de buziyokusi-ta*]_S
 node]_{ADV} *zisatusi-ta.*
 ‘John_i, because Mary had insulted John_i before other people,
 committed suicide.’

While the *b* sentences are ungrammatical due to the noncoreference rule, the *a* sentences are grammatical. If *kare* were an ordinary noun,

the *a* sentences should be ungrammatical due to the noncoreference rule, because NP₁ both commands and precedes NP₂ and NP₂ is a full noun. But, actually, the *a* sentences are grammatical. This suggests that *kare* behaves like a pronoun and it is not an ordinary noun.

For the above four reasons that I have given from page 2 through page 13, I conclude that *kare* and *kanozyo* are not the same as ordinary nouns.

III

However, I am not claiming that *kare* and *kanozyo* are the same as the English pronouns *he* and *she*. Though *kare* and *kanozyo* are anaphoric elements, their use is much restricted. First, Ohso (1976) points out the following stylistic or sociological conditions on full-pronominalization:¹⁰

The application of *Kare* Pronominalization [=what I call full-pronominalization] is more strongly conditioned stylistically and sociologically than ZP [Zero Pronominalization] and Reflexivization. . . . The referents of the pronouns arising as a result of *Kare* Pronominalization are also conditioned stylistically and sociologically. For example, they are usually not used to refer to small children. And many people who employ them avoid using them to refer to superiors (one's boss, teachers, elders, etc.) especially in formal occasions particularly in the presence of the referent. (p. 128)

Compare *a* with *b* in (18):

- (18) a. **watasi-no titi₁-wa [kare₁-ga zibun-de tukut-ta]_s puuru-de*
 I-of father-Top he-Subj for himself build-Past pool-in
mainiti oyoide iru.
 every day swimming is
 'My father₁ swims every day in the pool which he₁ built for

himself.'

- b. *boku-no yuuzin_i-wa [kare_i-ga zibun-de tukut-ta]_s puuru-de*
 I-of friend
mainiti oyoide iru.

'My friend_i swims every day in the pool which he_i built for himself.'

A second characteristic is that Japanese full-pronominalization works forward only. Though I have said in page 6 that the use of *kare* and *kanozyo* is subject to the *precedence* constraint suggests that *kare* and *kanozyo* behave like pronouns, it is possible to interpret this characteristic as indicating that *kare* and *kanozyo* are not like English pronouns, because while backward pronominalization is possible in English, backward full-pronominalization is not possible in Japanese. Compare *a* with *b* in (19):

- (19) a. *Although Tom recommended her_i, John did not give a prize to Mary_i.*

- b. *[[*Tom-ga kanozyo_i-o suisensi-ta*]_s *keredomo*]_{ADV} *John-wa*
 Subj she-Obj recommend-Past although Top
Mary_i-ni syoo-o atae-na-katta.
 to prize-Obj give-not-Past

'Although Tom recommended her_i, John did not give a prize to Mary_i.'

Thirdly, *kare* and *kanozyo* are different from the ϕ -pronoun and the reflexive *zibun* in that only *kare* and *kanozyo* are subject to the Specific Antecedent Condition, which is stated in (20):

- (20) *Specific Antecedent Condition:*

A full-pronoun cannot be coreferential with an NP if the NP

refers to a nonspecific person when the full-pronoun and the NP are in the same sentence.¹¹

As is shown in (21), when the antecedent is specific as to the referent, all types of pronominalization are possible, but when the antecedent is not specific as to the referent, full-pronominalization is impossible as is shown in (22) through (26).

- (21) a. *Mary_i-wa zibun_i-no/kanozyo_i(zisin)-no/φ_i ie-de sin-da.*
 Top self-of she(self)-of house-in die-Past

‘Mary_i died in self_i’s/her_i (own)/φ_i house.’

- b. *John_i-wa [[*zibun_i-ga/*kare_i-ga/φ_i sissinsi-ta]_s toki]_{ADV} boku-no*
 Top self-Subj he-Subj faint-Past when I-of

oyazi-no byooin-ni katugikom-are-ta.

father-of hospital-to take-Passive-Past

(*Zibun* and *kare* are not allowed here because of the functional constraints which I do not discuss in this paper.¹² The example is borrowed from Kuno (1972a).)

‘John_i, when self_i/he_i/φ_i fainted, was taken to my father’s hospital.’

- c. *Mary_i-wa [zibun_i-ga/kanozyo_i(zisin)-ga/*φ_i tate-ta]_s ie-ni*
 Top self-Subj she(self)-Subj build-Past house-in

sunde iru.

living is

(The φ-pronoun cannot be used here because of the functional constraint which I do not discuss in this paper.)

‘Mary_i is living in the house which self_i/she_i (herself)/φ_i built.’

- (22) a. $\left. \begin{array}{l} dare_i \text{ ('who')} \\ donna-hito_i \text{ ('what man')} \\ dono \text{ gakusei}_i \text{ ('which student')} \\ doko-kara \text{ kita hito}_i \text{ ('man who came from where')} \\ nani-o \text{ senkoosite iru gakusei}_i \text{ ('student who majors in what')} \end{array} \right\}$

-ga $zibun_i$ -no/* $kare_i(zisin)$ -no/ ϕ_i ie-de sin -da no-ka.
 Subj self-of he(self)-of house-in die-Past Question

$\left. \begin{array}{l} \text{'Who'} \\ \text{'What man'} \\ \text{'Which student'} \\ \text{'Man who came from where'} \\ \text{'Student who majors in what'} \end{array} \right\}$ died in self_i's/his_i(own)/ ϕ_i

house?'

- b. $dare_i$ -ga [[* $zibun$ -ga/* $kare_i$ -ga/ ϕ_i $sissinsi$ -ta]_S $toki$]_{ADV} $boku$ -no
 who-Subj self-Subj he-Subj faint-Past when I-of
 $oyazi$ -no $byooin$ -ni $katugikom$ -are-ta no-ka.
 father-of hospital-to take-Passive-Past Question

'Who_i was taken to my father's hospital' when self_i/he_i/ ϕ_i fainted?'

- c. $dare_i$ -ga [$zibun_i$ -ga/* $kare_i(zisin)$ -ga/* ϕ_i $tate$ -ta]_S ie -ni
 who-Subj self-Subj he(self)-Subj build-Past house-in
 $sunde$ iru no-ka.

living is Question

(* ϕ due to the functional constraint)

'Who_i is living in the house which self_i/he_i (himself)/ ϕ_i built?'

- (23) a. aru $hito_i$ -ga $watasi$ -no ie -ni
 a certain man-Subj I-of house-to

*zibun_i-no/*kare_i(zisin)-no/φ_i musume-o turete ki-ta.*
 self-of he(self)-of daughter-Obj taking come-Past
 'A certain man_i came to my house with self_i's/his_i (own)/φ_i
 daughter.'

b. *aru hito_i-ga [[*zibun_i-ga/*kare_i(zisin)-ga/φ_i sissinsi-ta]_s*
 a certain man-Subj self-Subj he(self)-Subj faint-Past
toki]_{ADV} boku-no oyazi-no byooin-ni katugikom-are-ta.
 when I-of father-of hospital-to take-Passive-Past
 'A certain man_i was taken to my father's hospital when self_i/
 he_i/φ_i fainted.'

c. *aru hito_i-ga [zibun_i-ga/*kare_i(zisin)-ga/*φ_i tate-ta]_s*
 a certain man-Subj self-Subj he(self)-Subj build-Past
ie-ni sunde iru.¹³
 house-in living is
 (*φ due to the functional constraint)
 'A certain man_i is living in the house which self_i/he_i (himself)/
 φ_i built.'

(24) *subeteno gakusei_i-wa [zibun_i-ga/*kare_i(zisin)-ga/*φ_i sudeni otona*
 all student-Top self-Subj he(self)-Subj already adult
dearu]_s koto-o zikakusite iru.
 is Nominalizer-Obj realizing is
 (*φ due to the functional constraint)
 'Every student has realized that self_i/he_i(himself)/φ_i is already
 adult.'

(25) *ono-ono-no gakusei_i-wa [zibun_i-ga/*kare_i(zisin)-ga/φ_i tukut-ta]_s*
 each student-Top self-Subj he(self)-Subj make-Past
kikai-o kyoozyu-ni mise-ta.
 machine-Obj professor-to show-Past

'Each student_i showed the professor the machine which self_i/he_i (himself)/ ϕ _i had made.'

- (26) *dareka_i-ga zibun_i-no/*kare_i(zisin)-no/ ϕ _i musume-o turete*
 somebody-Subj self-of he(self)-of daughter-Obj. taking
ki-ta.
 come-Past

'Somebody_i came with self_i's/his_i(own)/ ϕ _i daughter.'

Thus, full-pronouns are different from the ϕ -pronoun and the reflexive. And of course, they are different from English pronouns, which are not subject to the Specific Antecedent Condition.¹⁴

IV

In Section II, I have argued that *kare* and *kanozyo* are not the same as ordinary nouns but that they behave like pronouns. In Section III, on the other hand, I have pointed out that *kare* and *kanozyo* have some peculiarities which English pronouns do not have. The reason for these characteristics is historical. It is often argued that in ancient times, *kare* and *kanozyo* were only demonstratives like *kore* 'this', *sore* 'it', and *are* 'that' and that they began to be used as anaphoric pronouns only recently, under the influence of European languages. Therefore, as I have observed in this paper, they do not have complete distribution as anaphoric pronouns.

It may be concluded that at present, *kare* and *kanozyo* are special nouns or demonstratives that can be used as anaphoric elements only in limited contexts. To be more specific, *kare* and *kanozyo* may be something like pronominal epithets in the following examples:

- (27) a. *I wanted Charlie_i to help me, but the bastard_i wouldn't do it.*

- b. *Irving_i was besieged by a horde of bills and the poor guy_i couldn't pay them.*
- c. *Although the bum_i tried to hit me, I can't really get too mad at Harry_i.*

(The examples are from Jackendoff (1972 : 110))

But Lasnik (1976) points out that English pronominal epithets behave like full NP's. He says that pronominal epithets are not pronouns because a pronominal epithet, which is both commanded and preceded by a full NP, makes the sentence ungrammatical. His examples are as follows :

- (28) a. **John_i realizes that the sissy_i is going to lose.* (Lasnik's (21a))
- b. **The sissy_i realizes that the sissy_i is going to lose.* (Lasnik's (22))

And also in Japanese, pronominal epithets cannot be used as anaphoric elements intra-sententially. See the following examples :

- (29) a. *John_i-wa [kare_i-ga/*ano baka_i-ga hirotte kita]_S koinu-o*
 Top he-Subj that fool-Subj picked up puppy-Obj
daizini sodate-ta.
 carefully bring up-Past
 'John_i brought up carefully the puppy which he_i/that fool_i had
 picked up on the road.'
- b. *Mary_i-wa [[John-ga kanozyo_i-ni/*ano otenba_i-ni kekkon-o*
 Top Subj she-to that hussy-to marriage-Obj
moosikon-da]_S keredomo]_{ADV} uresiku-na-katta.
 propose-Past although glad-not-Past
 'Mary_i, although John proposed marriage to her_i/the hussy_i,
 was not glad.'

c. *sensei-wa* [[*Mary_iga kanningu-o sita*]_S *noni*]_{ADV}
 teacher-Top Subj cheated in the exam although

kanozyo_i-o/**sono otenba_i-o sikara-na-katta*.
 she-Obj the hussy-Obj scold-not-Past

'The teacher, although Mary_i had cheated in the exam, did not scold her_i/the hussy_i.'

Thus, as (29) shows, *kare* and *kanozyo* have different distribution from pronominal epithets.

In conclusion, tentatively accepting the interpretive theory of pronominalization, I propose that *kare* and *kanozyo* should be treated as anaphoric pronouns whose use is much restricted and that along with the reflexive and the ϕ -pronoun,¹⁵ *kare* and *kanozyo* should be listed in the lexicon of the Japanese grammar as lexical items. The lexical entries of the pronouns, therefore, would look like the following:

(30)	<i>kare</i>	<i>kanozyo</i>	<i>zibun</i>	ϕ -pronoun
	$\left(\begin{array}{l} +\text{Noun} \\ +\text{Pro} \\ +\text{Male} \\ +\text{3rd Person} \\ +\text{Singular} \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \end{array} \right)$	$\left(\begin{array}{l} +\text{Noun} \\ +\text{Pro} \\ +\text{Female} \\ +\text{3rd Person} \\ +\text{Singular} \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \end{array} \right)$	$\left(\begin{array}{l} +\text{Noun} \\ +\text{Pro} \\ +\text{Reflexive} \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \end{array} \right)$	$\left(\begin{array}{l} +\text{Noun} \\ +\text{Pro} \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \end{array} \right)$
	/kare/	/kanózyo/	/zibun/	/ ϕ /

Footnotes

* I am grateful to Emmon Bach, Chisato Kitagawa, Yasuyuki Nakai, Tae Okada, Barbara Partee, Tom Roeper, Ronald Taylor, and Edwin Williams for their comments and criticism on an earlier version of this paper.

I will use the following abbreviations in this paper:

Subj : Subject Case Marker

Obj : Object Case Marker

Top : Topic Marker

Past : Past Tense

Pres : Present Tense

S : Sentence

ADV: Adverbial

1. Kuroda discusses the so-called personal pronouns in general such as *watasi* 'I', *boku* 'I', *anata* 'you', *kimi* 'you', etc.. I will discuss only *kare* and *kanozyo* in this paper.

2. Hence the deletion of repeated nouns is called ϕ -pronominalization, and the blank left by the deletion is called ϕ -pronoun. I do not know whether a ϕ -pronoun is the product of deletion transformation or a ϕ -pronoun is introduced as a null anaphor in the base.

I also call *kare* and *kanozyo* full-pronouns and I call the use of *kare* and *kanozyo* full-pronominalization. I use the term *pronominalization* to refer to all types of anaphoric relations in Japanese, that is, ϕ -pronominalization, full-pronominalization, and reflexivization. Though I use the term *pronominalization*, I do not mean that what I call a pronoun is derived from a full noun transformationally.

3. In this paper I will discuss only the syntactic aspects of full-pronominalization. As for the inflections of *kare* and *kanozyo*, see Hinds (1971).

4. See Langacker (1969).

5. This is also pointed out in S. Nakai (1974), Y. Nakai (1974), and Ohso (1976).

6. Backward full-pronominalization is totally impossible in the examples (4a) through (4c). The examples (4d) through (4i) are ungrammatical but not so bad as the examples (4a) through (4c). The former are marginal. Some people may find backward full-pronominalization to be good in the examples (4d) through (4i). Kitagawa (personal communication) pointed out that the longer the distance between the antecedent and the full-pronoun is, the more acceptable the sentence is. He argued that the following example is more acceptable than (4g):

John_j-wa [ϕ ; *kanozyo_j-o nadametari sukasitari site*] *Mary_j-o paatii-ni turete*
 Top she-Obj by soothing Obj party-to taking
itta.
 went

'John_j, by soothing her_j, took Mary_j to the party.'

If backward full-pronominalization is possible, then the condition on full-pronomi-

nalization should be revised as follows:

A full-pronoun can be coreferential with an NP unless the full-pronoun both commands and precedes the NP.

which is the same as the condition on English pronominalization.

7. The condition is clearly a surface structure condition because the precedence relation between the antecedent and the full-pronoun is determined after Scrambling, which is supposed to be post-cyclic or last cyclic. Consider the following examples:

- a. *John-wa* [[*Tom-ga Mary_i-o misute-ta*]_S *node*]_{ADV} *kanozyo_i-o nagusame-ta*.
 Top Subj Obj desert-Past because she-Obj cheer-Past
 'John, because Tom had deserted Mary_i, cheered her_i up.'
- b. **John-wa* [[*Tom-ga kanozyo_i-o misute-ta*]_S *node*]_{ADV} *Mary_i-o nagusame-ta*.
 Top Subj she-Obj desert-Past because Obj cheer-Past
 'John, because Tom had deserted her_i, cheered Mary_i up.'
- a'. **John-wa kanozyo_i-o* [[*Tom-ga Mary_i-o misute-ta*]_S *node*]_{ADV} *nagusame-ta*.
 Top she-Obj Subj Obj desert-Past because cheer-Past
 'John cheered her_i up because Tom had deserted Mary_i.'
- b'. *John-wa Mary_i-o* [[*Tom-ga kanozyo_i-o misute-ta*]_S *node*]_{ADV} *nagusame-ta*.
 Top Obj Subj she-Obj desert-Past because cheer-Past
 'John cheered Mary_i up because Tom had deserted her_i.'

(a'), which comes from (a) through the application of Scrambling, is ungrammatical. (b'), which comes from (b) through the application of Scrambling, is grammatical. It is clear from the above examples that it is the precedence relation after the application of Scrambling that is relevant for (5).

8. The condition stated in (15) does not apply in certain cases. For example.

- a. [*mosi John_i-ga koko-ni i-tara*]_{ADV} *kitto kare_i-wa/φ_i*
 if Subj here be-Presumptive certainly he-Top
yorokobu-daroo.
 will be glad
 'If John_i were here, he_i/φ_i would be pleased, I'm sure.'

At present, I have no explanation for this exceptional case.

The condition stated in (15) covers not only full-pronominalization but also the other two pronominalizations, that is, φ-pronominalization and reflexivization. See the following examples:

- b. [[φ_i *issyookkenmei benkyoosi-ta*]_S *keredomo*]_{ADV} *John_i-wa siken-ni*
 hard study-Past although Top examination-in

sippaisi-ta.

fail-Past

'Although ϕ_i had studied hard, John_i failed the examination.'

b'. *[[John_i-ga issyookenmei benkyoosi-ta]_S keredomo]_{ADV} ϕ_i siken-ni sippaisi-ta.

'Although John_i had studied hard, ϕ_i failed the examination.'

c. [zibun_i-ga tate-ta]_S ie-ni John_i-wa sunde iru.
self-Subj build-Past house-in Top living is

'In the house which self_i built, John_i is living.'

c'. *[John_i-ga tate-ta]_S ie-ni zibun_i-ga sunde iru.

'In the house which John_i built, self_i is living.'

But the ungrammaticality of (b') and (c') can be accounted for in terms of another conditions which are independently needed. Therefore, at present, I do not claim the generality of the condition stated in (15).

9. Lasnik's important contention is that his noncoreference rule is the only relevant condition on the anaphoric relations in English. For example, the noncoreference rule predicts the ungrammaticality of the following sentence as well as the ungrammaticality of (8a).

a. *[[He_i]_{NP₁} thinks that [John_i]_{NP₂} is sick.

Since NP₁ precedes and commands NP₂ and NP₂ is not a pronoun, NP₁ *he* and NP₂ *John* are noncoreferential according to Lasnik's noncoreference rule.

Langacker's condition on pronominalization (Langacker (1969)), which says that NP_a may pronominalize NP_p unless NP_p precedes NP_a and NP_p commands NP_a, can also predict the ungrammaticality of (a), because the pronoun both precedes and commands the antecedent. But Langacker's condition cannot predict the ungrammaticality of (8a). In this respect, Lasnik's noncoreference rule is superior to Langacker's condition.

I do not intend to discuss in detail whether Lasnik's noncoreference rule is the only relevant condition on anaphoric relations in Japanese, but I would like to mention a few words about this topic.

The basic condition on full-pronominalization is given in (5), which is repeated here.

Prohibition of Backward Full-Pronominalization:

A full-pronoun can be coreferential with an NP if the NP precedes the full-pronoun.

(I am assuming that no backward full-pronominalization is possible.)

The noncoreference rule cannot be used instead of (5) because the noncoreference rule cannot predict the ungrammaticality of (b) although it can predict the ungrammaticality of (c).

- b. **John-wa [kare_i-ga dooro-o hasitte iru]_S no-o mituke-ta*
 Top he-Subj road-Obj running is Nominalizer-Obj find-Past
node]_{ADV} Tom_i-ni koe-o kake-ta.
 because to called

'John_i, because he_j saw him_i running on the road, called Tom_i.'

- c. **kare_i-wa [John_i-ga hirotte kita]_S koinu-o sodate-ta.*
 he-Top Subj picked up puppy-Obj bring up-Past

'He_i brought up the puppy which John_i had picked up on the road.'

And besides, as I have said above, the noncoreference rule must be supplemented by a special noncoreference rule (13) or (15).

The reflexivization rule cannot be replaced by the noncoreference rule, either. (For the details of reflexivization rules, see Oyakawa (1973, 1974), N. McCawley (1972), and Inoue (1976)). The noncoreference rule cannot predict the ungrammaticality of (d) in which the reflexive commands but follows the antecedent.

- d. **[[kookogakusya_i-no horidasi-ta]_S doki-no utukusisa-ga]_{NP} zibun_i-o*
 archaeologist-Subj unearth-Past pot-of elegance-Subj self-Obj
odorok-ase-ta. (from Oyakawa (1974))
 surprise-Past

'The elegance of the pot that the archaeologist_i had unearthed surprised self_i.'

From these reasons, I would conclude that the contention that the noncoreference rule is the only relevant condition on Japanese anaphoric relations cannot be supported.

10. For more detailed sociolinguistic study of the use of *kare* and *kanozyo*, see Hinds (1975).

11. When the antecedent which refers to a nonspecific person is in a preceding sentence in the discourse, a full-pronoun can apparently be used. Consider the following example:

- aru hito_i-ga zibun_i-no/*kare_i-no musume-o turete kimasi-ta.*
 a certain man-Subj self-of he-of daughter-Obj taking come-Past
kare_i-wa tote-mo se-ga takaku, hansamu desi-ta.
 he-Top very height-Subj tall handsome be-Past

'A man_i came with self_i's/his_i daughter. He_i was very tall and handsome.'

12. For the details of the functional constraints, see Kuno (1972a, b), Kuno and Kaburaki (1975), Nakai (1976), Nakai (in preparation), and Ohso (1976).
13. Chisato Kitagawa (personal communication) provided me with the following counter-examples, which seem to be acceptable.
- a. *tikatetu-kara deteki-ta hitori-no otoko_i-ga, kare_i-no mawari-o sewasinaku*
 subway-from came out one man-Subj he-of around restlessly
ikikau hitobito-ni itibetu-o atae-ru koto-mo naku, tabako-o
 pass people-to a glance-Obj without giving cigarette-Obj
toridasite hi-o take-ta.
 taking out lit
 'A man_i, who had just come out of the subway, took out a cigarette and lit it, without giving a glance at the people passing by him_i restlessly.'
- b. *aru otoko_i-wa, rikonsite ninennimo naru kare_i-no tuma-ni atta*
 a certain man-Top divorced two years passed he-of wife-with met
totan, mata kekonsi-taku-natta.
 when again wanted to marry
 'A certain man_i, when he_i saw his_i wife whom he_i had been divorced for for two years, wanted to marry her again.'

The Specific Antecedent Condition may have to be revised.

14. Though I have given only examples in which the antecedent is the subject, the Specific Antecedent Condition is valid when the antecedent is a non-subject NP. Consider the following example, where the question word is the object of the sentence.

*kimi-wa dare_i-o *zibun_i-no/*kare_i(zisin)-no/* ϕ _i ie-de mi-ta no-ka.*
 you-Top who-Obj self-of he(self)-of house-in see-Past Question
 'Whom_i did you see in self_i's/his_i (own)/ ϕ _i house?'

Kare cannot be coreferential with *dare* because of the Specific Antecedent Condition. *Zibun* cannot be coreferential with *dare* because of the subject-antecedent condition. (The antecedent of *zibun* must be the subject.) The ϕ -pronoun is coreferential with *kimi* 'you' and not with *dare*.

15. I tentatively assume that Japanese has the pronoun which is never phonetically realized.

References

- Hinds, J. (1971) "Personal Pronouns in Japanese," *Glossa* Vol. V, No. 2, 146-155.
 Hinds, J. (1975) "Third Person Pronouns in Japanese," in Peng (1975).

- Inoue, K. (1976) "Reflexivization: An Interpretive Approach," in Shibatani (1976).
- Jackendoff, R. (1972) *Semantic Interpretation in Generative Grammar*, The MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Kuno, S. (1972a) "Pronominalization, Reflexivization, and Direct Discourse," *Linguistic Inquiry* III, 161-195.
- Kuno, S. (1972b) "Functional Sentence Perspective," *Linguistic Inquiry* III, 269-320.
- Kuno, S. and E. Kaburaki (1975) "Empathy and Syntax," *Harvard Studies in Syntax and Semantics* Vol. I, 1-73.
- Kuroda, S. (1965) *Generative Grammatical Studies in the Japanese Language*, doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Langacker, R. (1969) "On Pronominalization and the Chain of Command," in Reibel and Schane (1969).
- Lasnik, H. (1976) "Remarks on Coreference," *Linguistic Analysis*, Vol. II, No. 1, 1-22.
- McCawley, N. (1972) *A Study of Japanese Reflexivization*, doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois.
- Nakai, S. (1974) "Identical NP Deletion, Pronominalization, and Reflexivization," *Doshisha Studies in English*, No. 7, 54-91.
- Nakai, S. (1976) "A Study of Anaphoric Relations in Japanese," unpublished paper, University of Massachusetts at Amherst.
- Nakai, S. (in preparation) "Using Pronouns Correctly."
- Nakai, Y. (1974) *Pronominalization in English and Japanese*, master's thesis, Doshisha University.
- Ohso, M. (1976) *A Study of Zero Pronominalization in Japanese*, doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University.
- Oyakawa, T. (1973) "Japanese Reflexivization I," *Papers in Japanese Linguistics*, Vol. II, No. 1, 94-135.
- Oyakawa, T. (1974) "Japanese Reflexivization II," *Papers in Japanese Linguistics*, III, 129-201.
- Peng, F. (1975) *Language in Japanese Society*, University of Tokyo Press, Tokyo.
- Reibel, D. and S. Schane, eds. (1969) *Modern Studies in English*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N. J.
- Shibatani, M. ed. (1976) *Syntax and Semantics Vol. 5: Japanese Generative Grammar*, Academic Press, New York, N. Y.